

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8 and 10 – 17 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

At the outset, Applicants note that although the Examiner addressed claims 1 – 17 in the Detailed Action, the Office Action Summary incorrectly indicated that only claims 1 – 17 are pending. Applicants note that claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8 and 10 – 17 are now pending in the present application, as indicated above.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Forbes (U.S. Pat. No. 5,918,360). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicant notes that claims 4 and 9 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject-matter contained therein.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to include that a radially outer edge of the stator teeth defines a crowned surface wherein a first radius of the crowned surface is less than a second radius defined by a circle that is tangent to a radially outermost point of the crowned surface of the stator teeth. Forbes fails to teach or suggest a radially outer edge of the stator teeth defining a crowned surface wherein a first radius of the crowned surface is less than a second radius defined by a circle that is tangent to a radially outermost point of the crowned surface of the stator teeth.

Forbes discloses a method of fabricating a salient pole, electronically commutated electric machine. The electric machine includes a plurality of salient pole

pieces 57 that each include a winding receiving section 59, a base section 61 and an arcuate tip section 63 (see Col. 6, Lines 27 – 37). Besides describing the tip section 63 as being arcuate in Col. 6, Line 31, Forbes provides no detail as to the definition of the arc of the tip section 63. More specifically, Forbes fails to teach or suggest a first radius of the crowned surface being less than a second radius defined by a circle that is tangent to a radially outermost point of the crowned surface of the salient pole. Although the Examiner has asserted that Forbes discloses such a feature, the Examiner has not provided a specific cite within Forbes and Applicants have been unable to locate such disclosure within Forbes. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11, Applicants respectfully note that each ultimately depends from one of claims 1 and 7, which define over the prior art, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 also define over the prior art for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 7, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 includes a slot opening between adjacent stator teeth being at least 10% of a tooth pitch of the adjacent stator teeth. Forbes fails to teach or suggest a slot opening between adjacent stator teeth being at least 10% of a tooth pitch of the adjacent stator teeth.

As discussed in detail above, Forbes discloses an electric machine including a plurality of salient pole pieces 57 that each include a winding receiving section 59, a base section 61 and an arcuate tip section 63 (see Col. 6, Lines 27 – 37). When the salient pole pieces 57 are secured in position, a plurality of winding slots 85 are defined

between adjacent salient pole pieces (see Col. 8, Lines 36 – 39). Each slot 85 includes a closed end 87 and an open end 89 that is defined between tip ends 63a,63b (see Col. 8, Lines 42 – 46 and Figure 10). Besides describing the existence of a slot opening, Forbes fails to teach or suggest a slot opening between adjacent stator teeth being at least 10% of a tooth pitch of the adjacent stator teeth. In fact, Forbes is completely silent as to the size of the open end 89 and tooth pitch in general. Although the Examiner has asserted that Forbes discloses such a feature, the Examiner has not provided a specific cite within Forbes and Applicants have been unable to locate such disclosure within Forbes. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 13 – 17, Applicants note that each ultimately depends from claim 12, which defines over the prior art, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 13 – 17 also define over the prior art for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 12, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 18, 2005

By: 
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDW/RPM